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## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

(New York)
A. Use of Frozen Processed Sea Food (Tables 1, 2)

Five sixths of all the establishments in New York said they bought sea food in the previous twetve months. However, less than a third of these made purchases of sea food in the frozen processed form.

Only 8 per cent of all the establishments said they had bought frozen processed fish in November, 1958; 18 per cent said they had bought frozen processed shellfish; while 6 per cent said they had hought portions.

Among institutions (such as schools and hospitals), the incidence of use of frozen processed sea food was much greater than among public eating places.

Of the ten cities in the survey, New York ranked tenth, in terms of the percentage of all establishments buying frozen processed sea food.
B. Frozen Processed Fish - Purchases, Attitudes, and Practices

1. Purchases: Species and Amount of Prepreparation (Tables 3, 4)

Thirty per cent of the users of frozen processed fish bought flounder fillets during November, 1958. Sizable percentages of establishments bought codfish fillets and sole fillets.

In terms of pounds bought, swordfish steaks and halibut steaks were the leading New York items.

Flounder fillets did not rank high in most other cities, although they enjoyed some popularity in Atianta and Houston.
2. Attitudes Toward Prepreparation and Quality and Condition of Fish (Tables 5, 6)

A great majority of New York purchasers were satisfied with the present prepreparation of fish, and with the quality and condition of the fish.

This was generally true for the ten cities included in the survey.
3. Packaging of Fish (Tables 7, 8)

Data on packaging of fish in New York were limited. Flounder fillets and codfish fillets, the two most popular items, were of ten bought in 5 pound packages.
4. Methods of Preparing and Serving Fish Table 9)

Frying was the most popular method of preparing fish among New York establishments. The average establishment served 64 per cent of its fish fried. Frying was the leading method in all ten cities of the study.

Broiling was also a rather common method of preparation in New York. The average establishment served 18 per cent of its fish brailed.
C. Frozen Processed Sbellfish - Purchases, Att1tudea, and Practices

1. Purchases: Speciea and Type of Prepreparation (Tables 10, 11)

Two fifths of the users of ahellfish bought breaded shrimp in November, 1958. Frozen raw shritp was bought by almost as many establishmenta, sind was the leading item in terms of total quantity purchased.

Bresded scallops were also purchased by a number of establishmenta.

Breaded shrimp and raw shrimp. were bought widely and in large quantities in all of the cities included in the study.
2. Attitudes Toward Prepreparation; Toward Quslity and Condition of Shellfish
(Tables 12, 13)
All but a few purchasers were satiafied with the present prepreparation of shellfish, and with the quality and condition of the shellfish which they bought.

The same held generally true for the other cities in the survey.
3. Packaging of Shellfish (Tables 14, 15)

Shellfish items were characteristicslly bought in 5 pound packages in Nev York.
4. Methods of Freparing Eng Serving Shellfish
(Table 16)
Frying was the most popular way of prepsring shellfish in New York. The typical establishment served 52 per cent of ita shellfish fried.

As with fish, frying was the lesding method of prepsring shellfish in all ten cities of the study.
D. Portion Contralled Sea Food - Purchases, Att1tudes, and Practices

1. Furchases: Type of Prepreparstion (Tables $1,17,18,19$ )

Only 6 per cent of all the eatablishments in New York bought portiona during November, 1958.

As with frozen processed ses food in general, New York ranked tenth, in the percentage of eatsblistments buying portions.

In New Yotk, portions were most frequently bought cooked and breaded; and the quantity purchased was greater than that of any other type of preprepsration.

More than half of the purchasers of portions said that they were currently buying about the same amount of portions as the year before. Twenty-four per cent asid they were buying more, and 1 per cent asid they vere buying less.
2. Attitudes Toward Portions (Tables 20, 21, 22, 23, 24)

Nearly all establishments baid they were aitisfied with the quality sad condition of portions.

Thirteen per cent of the users of portions said they thought the quality of portions was better than that of other frozen processed fish. Almost three fourths of the users rated the quality as about the same, while 3 per cent considered the quality poorer.

Major advantages cited for portions included:

|  | \% of <br> Users <br> Citing |
| :--- | :---: |
| Size of portions, uniform portions | 56 |
| Convenience, ease of preparation | 48 |
| Fast, timesaving | 24 |
| Economy, no waste | 23 |
| Can control food costs better - | 21 |

About one fourth of the users cited some disadvantage to using portions. A variety of disadvantages were mentioned.

Users of portions generally thought their customers
liked portions the same as other types of frozen processed fish. Fewer than 3 per cent said that their customers liked portions less than other types of frozen processed sea food.

## 3. Packaging of Portions (Tables 25, 26)

New York purchasers tended to buy portions in larger packages than purchasers in other cities. The average weight of a package of portions for the city was 6.5 pounds.

They also tended to buy individual portions of
larger size, and the average weight of an individual portion was 6.3 ounces.

Almost all establishments, in New York and the other nine cities, said they were satisfied with the size of portions in the packages.
4. Methods of Preparing and Serving Portions (Tables 27, 28)

Frying was the most widely used method of preparing and serving portions in New York, with 89 per cent of the establishments serving them this way. The average establishment served 75 per cent of its portions fried

Frying was the leading method in nine of the ten cities of the study. The exception was Springfield, Mossachusetts, where baking was the most popular method.

Almost two thirds of the New York establishments using portions cooked them while frozen.
5. Cost of Using Portions (Table 29)

Fewer than a sixth of the establishments using portions said they were more expensive than other forms of frozen processed fish. A large majority of users considered them less expensive, or rated them about the same.
6. Miscellaneous Findings About Portions (Tables 30, 31)

More than three fourths of the New York purchasers said they specified the kind of fish when ordering portions.

Only 5 per cent of the users suggested any new portion items, not now available, which they would like to have.

## 7. Nonusers of Portions (Table 32)

Establishments which used frozen processed sea food, but not portions, gave a number of reasons for not buying portions: they served other types of fish, they sold comparatively little fish. they used rresh fish.
E. Suppliers of Frozen Processed Sea Food

Establishments in New York tended to buy frozen processed sea food from a variety of suppliers. The suppliers were usually less than ten miles from the establishments, and made weekly deliveries. Establishments as a rule were satisfled with the services of the suppliers.

Sea food wholesalers supplied 40 per cent of the establishments, while frozen food distributors accounted for another 28 per cent. Some of the smaller establishments used such suppliers as supermarkets and groceries.

Main suppliers werp located less than ten miles from the estabilshment, in 81 per cent of the cases.

In a littie more than haif the cases, deliveries were made once a week.

Only a small percentage of the purchasers said they could think of ways in which the auppliers could ipprove their services.
F. Expenditures for Frozen Pr essed Sea Food; Its Profitability (Tables, 7,38 )

Two fifths of the establishments reporting in New York sald that they spent less than $\$ 250$ for frozen processed sea food during the preceding twelve wonths. The figures ranged upward to $\$ 100,000$ and over, with the median coming at \$383.

Somewhat more than half of the profit-making establishments which expressed an opinion, considered frozen processed sea food more profitable than other high protein foods.
G. Government Inspection of Frozen Processed Sea Food - Awareness, Effect, and Attitudes (Tables 39, 40, 41, 42)

Two thirds of the establishments in New York were aware that they could buy frozen processed sea food, which had been inspected or graded by the United States Government.

Of those who were unaware, a small number said they would buy more sea food if Government inspected sea food were available. Most said they would buy about the same amount, or that they did not know.

Nine tenths of the establishments, who were aware that they could buy Government inspected or graded aea food, said that they had bought some. When purchasers were aaked if the inspection had affected tbe amount of frozen processed sea food which they bought, 5 per cent said the inspection had caused them to buy more.
H. Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food; Cold Storage Facilities (Tables 43, 44, 45)

Most nonusers in New York said they had never bought frozen processed sea food. Frequently the establishments said they used little or no fish, or that they used fresh fish.

Findings regarding cold storage facilities among nonusers in New York may be sumarized as follows:

Total Nonusers of Frozen
Processed Sea Food 100
Have cold storage facilities $\quad \underline{3}$
Don't use sea food at all ..... 10

Use sea food, but not frozen
processed sea food

43

## DETAILED FINDINGS

Table 1

DID THE ESTABLISEMENT BUY SEA FOOD IN THE PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS?
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Restaurents | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establishments | All <br> Others | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (1171) | (949) | (77) | (44) | (101) | (587) | (293) | (121) | (170) |
|  | $\underline{L}$ | $\underline{L}$ | $\pm$ | ¢ | \& | $\pm$ | $\pm$ | $\pm$ | $\pm$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, bought sea food | 83.3 | 87.1 | 54.5 | 100.0 | 58.9 | 78.5 | 88.0 | 91.7 | 86.2 |
| Bought frozen processed sea food | 23.8 | $\frac{22.2}{6.9}$ | 36.4 | 63.6 | 16.9 | 13.8 | 25.7 | 36.8 | 47.2 |
| Bought frozen processed fish | 8.3 | 6.9 | 19.5 | $\overline{27.3}$ | 7.3 | 4.6 | 9.7 | 10.4 | 17.4 |
| Bought frozen processed shellfish | 17.5 | 17.5 | 24.7 | 29.5 | 8.9 | 7.8 | 19.7 | 32.6 | 37.9 |
| Bought portions | 5.7 | 3.9 | 26.0 | 22.7 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 7.4 | 6.3 | 13.8 |
| No, did not buy see food | 16.7 | 12.9 | 45.5 | - | 41.1 | 21.5 | 12.0 | 8.3 | 13.8 |

Table 2

DID THE ESTABLISHMENT BUY FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD IN THE PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS?
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments Purchasing Sea Food in Preceding 12 Months | (969) | (823) | (42) | (44) | (60) | (458) | (256) | (109) | (146) |
|  | q | $\pm$ | \& | 中 | $\pm$ | $\underline{\underline{6}}$ | $\pm$ | $\underline{6}$ | $\pm$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, bought frozen processed sea food | 28.6 | 25.4 | 66.7 | 63.6 | 28.8 | 17.6 | 29.2 | 40.2 | 54.8 |
| No, did not buy frozen processed sea food | 71.4 | 74.6 | 33.3 | 36.4 | 71.2 | 82.4 | 70.8 | 59.8 | 45.2 |

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Tots 1 | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Eating <br> Placea | Institutiona | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lesa } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish | (103) | (76) | (27) | (28) | (30) | (45) |
|  | 中 | $\underline{L}$ | $\underline{2}$ | $\pm$ | 2 | $\underline{1}$ |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| $\frac{\text { Bluef1sh }}{\text { Fillets }}$ | . 9 | - | 3.7 | - | - | 2.0 |
| Cod |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded | 1.7 | ${ }_{16}^{2.2}$ | 40.7 | 27.3 | 2.9 23.5 | 2.0 18.4 |
| Fillets | 22.4 | 16.9 | 60.7 | 27.3 6.1 | 23.5 | 18.4 |
| Steaks | 3.4 | 2.2 | 7.4 | 6.1 | - | 4.1 |
| Breaded fillets | 2.6 | 3.4 | - | 9.1 | - | 1 |
| Shredded | 1.7 | 2.2 | - | - | - | 4.1 |
| Cakes, cooked and breaded | . 9 | - | 3.7 | - | 2.9 | - |
| Rav | . 9 | 1.1 | - | - | - | 2.0 |
| Fish Cakes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | . 9 | 1.1 | 7 | 3.0 | - |  |
| Breaded | 6.0 | 5.6 | 7.4 | ${ }^{-}$ | 11.8 | 6.1 |
| Cooked and breaded | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 6.1 | 2.9 | 2.0 |
| Rav | . 9 | 1.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - |
| Flounder |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded | 4.3 | 5.6 | - | 3.0 | 8.8 | 2.0 |
| Fillets | 30.2 | 32.6 | 22.2 | 36.4 | 17.0 | 34.7 |
| Cooked and breaded | . 9 | 1.1 | - | - | - | 2.0 |
| Cooked filiets | . 9 | 1.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - |
| Breaded fi leta | 1.7 | 2.2 | - | - | 5.9 | . |
| Raw | . 9 | 1.1 | - | - | - | 2.0 |
| Haddock 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | . 9 | 1.1 | - | - | 2.9 | 0 |
| Breaded | 2.6 | 3.4 | - | - ${ }^{-}$ | 5.9 | 2.0 |
| Fillets | 12.1 | 7.9 | 25.9 | 15.2 | 8.8 | 12.2 |
| Steaks | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 6.1 | - | 4.1 |
| Cooked and breaded | . 9 | 1.1 | - | $\bigcirc$ | - | 2.0 |
| Cooked fillets | . 9 | 1.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - |
| Breaded fillets | . 9 | 1.1 | - | - | 2.9 | - |

*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

Table 3
(Contd.)

FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 - HOW PROCESSED BEFORE PURCHASE (Continued)

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public |  | Less |  | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating |  | Than | \$10,000- | and |
|  |  | Places | Institutions | \$10,000 | 39,999 | Over |
|  | \% | \$ | \$ | \& | \& | \% |
| Halibut |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ereaded | . 9 | 1.1 | - | - | 2.9 | - |
| Fillets | 8.6 | 7.9 | 11.1 | 9.1 | 5.9 | 10.2 |
| Steaks | 9.5 | 9.0 | 11.1 | - | 20.6 | 8.2 |
| Cooked and breaded | . 9 | 1.1 | - | - | - | 2.0 |
| Heads off | . 9 | 1.1 | - | - | - | 2.0 |
| Raw | 5.2 | 5.6 | 3.7 | - | - | 12.2 |
| Mackerel 3 e 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 8.8 | - |
| Ocean Perch |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 2.6 | - | 11.1 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.0 |
| Steaks | 1.7 | 2.2 | - | 6.1 | - | - |
| Cooked and breaded | . 9 | 2.1 | - | - | - | 2.0 |
| Salmon 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Steaks | 3.4 | 2.2 | 7.4 | - | 5.9 | 4.1 |
| Raw | 1.7 | 1.1 | 3.7 | - | - | 4.1 |
| Sole |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 16.4 | 16.9 | 14.8 | 21.2 | 14.7 | 8.2 |
| Cooked and broaded | . 9 | 1.1 | - | 6 | - | - |
| Breaded fi zets | 3.4 | 4.5 | - | 6.1 | $=-y$ | - |
| Swordfish 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 3.4 | - | 14.8 | 3.0 | 5.9 | 4.1 |
| Fillets | 1.7 | 2.2 | - | 3.0 | 2.9 11.8 | 83 |
| Steaks | 8.6 | 7.9 | 11.1 | 6.1 | 11.8 | 82 |
| Raw | . 9 | 1.1 | - | - | - | <0 |
| Trout |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw | 2.6 | 2.2 | 37 | - | - | 61 |

QUANTITY OF FROZEN PROCESSED PISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958

|  | Total Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  |  | Total Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Eatablishments | Eetablishments |  |  | All | User |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Eatablishments | Establiahments |
| Bluefish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 25 | (a) | 25.0 | Halibut |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Breaded | 10 | (a) | 10.0 |
| Cod |  |  |  | Pillete | 376 | (b) | 37.6 |
| Breaded | 100 | (b) | 50.0 | Steaka | 7,334 | 5.2 | 666.7 |
| Fillets | 1,841 | 1.3 | 70.8 | Cooked and breaded | (a) | - | - |
| Steaks | 8 | (a) | 2.0 | Heads off | (a) | - | - |
| Breaded fillets | 34 | (a) | 11.3 | Rav | 2,730 | 1.9 | 455.0 |
| Shredded | 200 | (b) | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Cakes, cooked and breaded | 20 | (a) | 20.0 | $\frac{\text { Mackerel }}{\text { Fillets }}$ | 220 | (b) | 30.0 |
| Raw | (a) | (a) | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Ocean Perch |  |  |  |
| Fish Cakea |  |  |  | Fillets | 100 | (b) | 33.3 |
| Cooked | 4 | (a) | 4.0 | Steaks | 40 | (a) | 20.0 |
| Breaded | 228 | (b) | 32.5 | Cooked and breaded | (a) |  | - |
| Cooked and breaded | 114 | (b) | 28.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Raw | 5 | (a) | 5.0 | Salmon |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Steaks | 90 | (b) | 22.5 800.0 |
| Flounder |  |  |  | Raw | 1,600 | 1.1 | 800.0 |
| Breaded | 62 | (a) | 12.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Fillets | 1,050 | . 7 | 30.0 | Sole |  |  |  |
| Cooked and breaded | (a) | - |  | Fillets | 1,537 | 1.1 | 80.9 |
| Cooked fillets | (a) | - | - | Cooked and breaded | (a) | (a) | ${ }^{-}$ |
| Breaded filleta | 96 | (b) | 48.0 | Breaded Pillets | 52 | (a) | 13.0 |
| Raw | (a) | - | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Swordfish |  |  |  |
| Heddock |  |  |  | Cooked | (a) |  | 53.0 |
| Cooked | 12 | (a) | 12.0 | Fillets | 106 | (b) | 53.0 |
| Breaded | 135 | (b) | 45.0 | Steaks | 8,056 | (b) | 805.6 200.0 |
| Fillets | 851 | . 6 | 60.8 | Raw | 200 | (b) | 200.0 |
| Steaks | 153 | (b) | 38.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked and breaded | (a) | - | - | $\frac{\text { Trout }}{\text { Raw }}$ |  |  |  |
| Cooked fillets | (8) ${ }_{20}$ | (a) | 20.0 | Raw | 728 | . 5 | 242.7 |
| Breaded filleta | 20 | (a) | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |

(a) Purchasea were not reported in quantities large enough to compute meaningful figurea.
(b) Leas than half a pound.

## Table 5

SATISFACTION OR DISSATISFACTION WITH PREPREPARATION OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH

|  | Total Users (1) $\qquad$ |  | Total Users (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \& |  | \% |
| Total Purchases of Cod | 100.0 | Total Purchases of Halitut | 16.0 |
| Prefer more prepreparation of cod | - | Prefer more prepreparation of helibut |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of cod |  | Prefer less frepreparation of halibut |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 97.4 | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 160.0 |
| No answer | 2.6 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Purchases of Sole | 200.0 |
| Total Purchases of Flounder | 100.0 |  |  |
|  |  | Prefer more prepreparation of sole |  |
| Frefer more prepreparation of flounder | 2.2 | Prefer less prepreparation of sole |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of flounder | - | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 87.5 |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 91.1 | No answer | 12.5 |
| No answer | 6.7 |  |  |
| Total Purchases of Haddock | 100.0 |  |  |
| Prefer more prepreparation of haddock | - |  |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of haddock | 96. |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 96.0 |  |  |
| No answer | 4.0 |  |  |

Table 6

SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION
WITH QUALITY AND CONDITION
OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH

## Total Users of Frazen Processed <br> $\begin{array}{r}\text { Total Users of Frozen Processed } \\ \text { Fish, November. } 1958 \\ \hline\end{array}$

## Satisfled

No answer

## Table 7

## PACFAGE SIZES OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF SERVINGS PER POUND(1)

| Total Purchasers of Cod Fillets |  | Tatal | Total Purchasers of Flounder Fillets | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | E |  | 2 |
|  |  | 100.0 |  |
| 1 pound packages |  |  | 23.0 | Packages less than 1 pound | 2.9 |
| 2 pound packages |  | 11.5 | 1 pourd packages | 28.5 |
| 3 pound packages |  | 3.9 | 2 pound packages | 5.7 |
| 4 pound packages |  | 7.6 | 3 pound packages | 11.4 |
| 5 Found packages |  | 38.4 | 5 pound packages | 37.1 |
| 6 pound packages |  | 3.9 | 10 pound packsges | 2.9 |
| 12 pound packages |  | 3.9 | 25 pound packages | 2.9 |
| 20 pound packages |  | 3.9 | No answer | 8.6 |
| 25 pound packages |  | 3.9 | Average number of servings per pound |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3.2 |

## Table 8

## SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION <br> WITE TYPES AND SIZES OF FROZEN <br> PROCESSED FISE PACKAGES

Total Users of Frozen Processed

Fisk, November, 1958 | Total |
| ---: |

(1) The table shows figures for those species and types of prepreparation which occur most often in the city.

Sometimes figures are shown for package sizes but not average number of servings per pound. In these cases the dats on servings per pound is limited.

The percentages in the body of the table are based on the number of establishments which bought one species of fiah, preprepared in one manner.

PERCENTTAGE OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH SERVED FRIED, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume


Table 9
(Contd.)

PERCENTACR OP FROZEN PROCESSED FIS日 SERVED FRIED, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS
(Continued)
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 140,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish | (103) | (76) | (27) | (28) | (30) | (45) |
|  | \& | $\pm$ | \& | $\pm$ | \% | ¢ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Baked 40.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None baked | 70.8 | 79.8 | 40.8 | 72.7 | 76.5 | 65.3 |
| 1-14\% | 1.7 | 1.1 | 3.7 | - | - | 4.1 |
| 15-34\% | 6.0 | 4.5 | 11.1 | - | 8.8 | 8.2 |
| 35-64\% | 3.4 | 4.5 | - | 3.0 | 5.9 | 2.0 |
| 65-84\% | - | - | - | $\bigcirc$ | - | - |
| Over 84\% | 5.2 | - | 22.2 | 6.1 | 2.9 | 6.1 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 12.9 | 10.1 | 22.2 | 18.2 | 5.9 | 14.3 |
| Average percentage served | 9.3 | 3.8 | 30.3 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 10.5 |
| Eatablishments Serving in other Ways 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None in other ways | 82.7 | 85.4 | 74.1 | 81.8 | 94.1 | 75.6 |
| 1-14\% | - | - | - | - | - | $5 \cdot$ |
| 15-34\% | . 9 | 1.1 | - | - | - | 2.0 |
| 35-64\% | - | $\cdots$ | - | - | - | - |
| 65-84\% | . 9 | 1.1 | -7 | - | - | 2.0 |
| Over 84, | 2.6 | 2.3 | 3.7 | - ${ }^{-}$ | - | 6.1 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 12.9 | 10.1 | 22.2 | 18.2 | 5.9 | 14.3 |
| Average percel lage se ved | 3.7 | 3.6 | 4.4 | - | - | 9.0 |

Table 10

FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH BOUGRT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 - HOW PROCESSED BEFORE PURCHASE
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | Less <br> Than <br> $\$] 0,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish | (209) | (177) | (32) | (43) | (59) | (40) | (67) |
|  | \$ | \$ | q | ¢ | $\pm$ | 2 | 2 |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Clams |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded | . 4 | . 5 | - | - | - | - | 1.4 |
| Chopped | 1.6 | - | 12.5 | - | 2.9 | 2.1 | 1.4 |
| Shelled and debellied | . 8 | . 9 | - | - | - | - | 2.7 |
| Raw; clean | 2.4 | 1.9 | 6.3 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 4.3 | - |
| Crabs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 1.2 | 1.4 | - | 3.6 | 1.4 | - | - |
| Breaded | . 8 | - | 6.3 | - | 1.4 | 2.1 | - |
| Whole frozen uncooked | 1.6 | 1.9 | - | 5.4 | - | - | 1.4 |
| Cooked and breaded | . 8 | . 9 | - | 3.6 | - | - | - |
| Crab meat, shelled and debellied, frozen and canned | 1.2 | . 9 | 3.1 | - | - | - | 4.1 |
| Lobster |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 2.0 | 2.3 | - | 71 | 1.4 | - | - |
| Shelled | . 4 | . 5 | - | - | - | - | 1.4 |
| Cooked lobster meat | . 4 | . 5 | - | - |  | - | 1.4 |
| Block frozen lobster meat | . 8 | . 9 | - | - | - | - | 2.7 |
| Cleaned and deheade tails | 8.9 | 9.8 | 3.1 | 8.9 | 5.6 | - | 17.6 |
| Raw; whole, clean | 3.3 | 2.8 | 6.3 | 7.1 | 2.9 | 2.1 | 1.4 |
| Oysters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked | . 8 | .9 | - | 3.6 | - | - | . |
| Breaded | 1.2 | . 9 | 3.1 | - | 2.9 | 2.1 | - |
| Cooked and breaded | . 4 | - | 3.1 | - | - | 2.1 | - |

*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

## Table 10

(Contd.)

PROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 - HOW PROCESSED BEFORE PURCHASE
(Continued)
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | E | \& | \& | q | 2 | 1 |  |
| Scallops 12.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked and breaded | 1.2 | 1.4 | - | 1.8 | 1.4 | - | 1.4 |
| Raw; clean, shelled | 4.5 | 4.7 | 3.1 | 8.9 | 2.9 | - | 5.4 |
| $\frac{\text { Scongilli }}{\text { Cooked, shelled }}$ | . 4 | . 5 | - | - | 1.4 | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breaded | 39.8 | 42.5 | 21.9 | 37.5 | 44.9 | 27.7 | 44.6 |
| Cooked and breaded | 4.1 | 3.3 | 9.4 | 5.4 | 4.3 | 6.4 | 1.4 |
| Breaded steak | . 8 | . 9 | - | $\bigcirc$ | 2.9 | 17. | 6.8 |
| Deheaded, raw in shell | 7.3 | 8.4 | - | 7.1 | 1.4 | 17.0 | 6.8 |
| Broken pieces | 16 | - | 6.3 | - | 2.9 | 2.1 | 1.4 |
| Raw; clean, deheaded shelled and deveirued | 37.0 | 36.0 | 43.8 | 37.5 | 34.8 | $\cdots 4$ | 36.5 |

Table $11^{\circ}$

## QUANTITY OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958

|  | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Total |  |
| Founds | Estabil |  |
| Ushments | Establishments |  |


(s) Purchases were not reported in quantities large enough to compute meaningful figures.
(b) Less than half a pound.

Table 11
(Contd.)

## QUANTITY OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER: 1958

|  | Average Number of Pounds |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | A11 | User |
|  | Pounds | Establishments | Establishments |
| Scallops |  |  |  |
| Breaded | 1,048 | . 7 | 33.8 |
| Cooked and breaded | 67 | (b) | 22.3 |
| Raw; clean, shelled | 231 | (b) | 20.7 |
| Scongilli |  |  |  |
| Cooked, shelled | 24 | (b) | 24.0 |
| Shrimp |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 1.308 | . 9 | 50.3 |
| Breaded | 5,988 | 4.3 | 61.1 |
| Cooked and breaded | 570 | (b) | 57.0 |
| Breaded steak | 48 | (b) | 24.0 |
| Deheaded, raw in shell | 8,010 | 5.7 | 445.0 |
| Broken pieces | 156 | . 1 | 39.0 |
| Raw; clean, deheaded, shelled and deveined | 10,902 | 7.8 | 120.8 |
| (a) Purchases were not reported in quantities |  |  |  |

Table 12

SATISFACTION OR DLSSATISFACTION WITH PREPREPARATION OF FROZEN YROCESSED SHELLFISH

|  | Total Users $\qquad$ (1) |  | Toter Users $\qquad$ (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$ |  | $\underline{1}$ |
| Total Purchases of Lobster | 100.0 | Total Purchases of Shrime | 100.0 |
| Prefer more prepreparation of lobster | - | Prefer more prepreparation of shrimp | . 6 |
| Prefer less prepreparation of lobster | ${ }^{-}$ | Prefer less prepreparation of shrimp | 2.0 |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 100.0 | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 4. 8 |
|  |  | No answer | 1.6 |
| Total Purchases of Scallops | 100.0 |  |  |
| Prefer more prepreparation of scallops | 2.2 |  |  |
| Prefer less prepreparstion of scallops | 4.5 |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 84.4 |  |  |
| No answer | 8.9 |  |  |

(1) The percentages shown in the body of the table are computed on the total number of purchases of each spectes of shellfish.

Many establishments bought more than one species. Some establishments also bought a species prepared in two different ways. For example, shrimp breaded and shrimp cooked. Th1s was counted as two purchases of the species.
Because purchases of same spectes--clams, abalone, and othera-were few in number, the species are not included in the table.

Table 13

SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION
WITH QUALITY AND CONDITION OF
FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH

Total Users of Frozen Processed Sbellf1sb, November, 1958

Satiafied

|  | Total |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \& |  | ¢ |
| Total Purchasers of Lobster Tails - Cleaned and Deheaded | 100.0 | Total Purchasers of Shrimp - Breaded | 100.0 |
| Packages less than 1 pound | 31.9 | 2 pound packages | 7.1 |
| 1 pound packages | 4.5 | 3 pound packages | 36.8 |
| 5 pound packages | 4.5 | 4 pound packages | 10.2 |
| 10 pound packages | 22.7 | 5 pound packages | 39.8 |
| 18 pound packages | 4.5 | 20 pound packages | 1.0 |
| 20 pound packages | 13.7 | 25 pound packages | 2.0 |
| 50 pound packages and over | 4.5 | No answer | 3.1 |
| No miswer | 13.7 |  |  |
|  |  | Average number of aervings per pound | 3.2 |
| Total Purchasers of Scallops - Breaded | 100.0 | Total Purchasers of Shrimp - Raw | 100.0 |
| Packages leas than 1 pound | 9.7 | Packages less than 1 pound 1 pound package | 3.3 1.1 |
| 3 pound packages | 22.6 | 2 pound packages | 5.5 |
| 5 pound packages | 51.6 | 3 pound packages | 18.7 |
| No answer | 16.1 | 5 pound packager | 62.6 |
| Average number of servings |  | 6 pound packagea | $3 \cdot 3$ |
| per pound | 2.9 | 8 pound packages | 1.1 |
|  |  | 25 pound packages | 1.1 |
|  |  | 50 pound packages and over | 1.1 |
|  |  | No answer | 2.2 |
| Total Purchasers of Shrirrp - Cooked | $\underline{100.0}$ | Average number of servings per pound | 4.2 |
| Packagea less than 1 pound | 11.5 |  |  |
| 3 pound packages | 15.4 |  |  |
| 4 pound packages | 7.7 |  |  |
| 5 pound packageb | 53.8 |  |  |
| 6 pound packages | 3.9 |  |  |
| 10 pound packages | 7.7 |  |  |
| Average number of eervings per pound | 5.4 |  |  |

(1) The table show figures for those species and types of prepreparation which occur moat often in the city. Sometimes figures are shown for package sizes but not average number of servinge per pound. In these cases the data on servings per pound is limited.

The percentages in the body of the table are based on the number of establishmenta which bought one species of shellfish, preprepared in one manner.

## Table 10

RERCENTAGE OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH SERVED FRIED, BROIWED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

| tal Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volurne |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\$ 100,000$ <br> and <br> Over |
|  |  | (177) | (32) | (43) | (59) | (40) | (67) |
|  | E | \& | 2 | \& | 2 | 2 | $\underline{L}$ |
|  | $\underline{200.0}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | $\underline{100.0}$ | $\underline{100.0}$ |
| Establishments Serving Fried 26.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-14\% | 3.7 | 4.2 |  | 7.1 | 2.9 | - | 4.1 |
| 15-34\% | 5.7 | 6.1 | 3.1 | - | 5.8 | 4.3 | 10.8 |
| 35-64\% | 14.6 | 13.6 | 21.9 | 12.5 | 8.7 | 29.8 | 12.2 |
| 65-84\% | 6.5 | 7.0 | 3.1 | 8.9 | 7.2 | 2.1 | 6.8 |
| Over 84\% | 38.6 | 41.6 | 18.8 | 51.8 | 47.9 | 25.5 | 28.3 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 4.5 | 2.3 | 18.8 | - | 5.8 | 2.1 | 8.1 |
| Average percentage served | 51.6 | 53.2 | 38.4 | 61.0 | 58.7 | 41.8 | 43.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None broiled | 80.4 | 81.8 | 71.9 |  |  | 2.1 | 5.4 |
| 1-14\% | 4.9 | 5.1 | 3.1 | 8.9 | 2.9 1.4 | 2.1 | 5.4 10.8 |
| $15-34 \%$ $35-64 \%$ | 5.3 3.3 | 5.6 3.3 | 3.1 | 1.8 | 4.3 | 4.3 | $\underline{2.7}$ |
| 65-84\% | . 4 | . 5 | 3. | - |  | - | 1.4 |
| Over $84 \%$ | 1.2 | 1.4 | - | 1.8 | - | - | 2.7 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 4.5 | 2.3 | 18.8 | - | 5.8 | 2.1 | 8.1 |
| Average percentage served | 4.9 | 5.1 | 3.1 | 4.9 | 2. 9 | 2.3 | -8.6 |

Note: Percentages, other than average percentages, are based on total establishments interviewed. Average percentages are computed by assigning the cases in any one of the six intervals to the midpoint of the interval, and taking an average of all the cases

| Total Users of Frozen Processed Shellfish | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | Less Than \$10,000 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  | (209) | (177) | (32) | (43) | (59) | (40) | (67) |
|  | \% | \& | \& | 中 | $\underline{2}$ | ¢ | \$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None baked | 90.3 2.0 | 92.9 2.3 | 71.8 | 96.4 3.6 | 89.9 1.4 | 91.5 | 85.1 2.7 |
| 1-14\% | 2.0 1.2 | 2.3 .5 | 6.3 | 3.6 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 2.7 |
| 35-64\% | . 4 | . 5 | - | - | - | 2.1 | - |
| 65-84\% | . 4 | . 5 | - | - | - | - | 1.4 |
| Over $84 \%$ | 1.2 | 1.0 | 3.1 | - | 2.9 | 2.1 | $\bigcirc$ |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 4.5 | 2.3 | 28.8 | - | 5.8 | 2.1 | 8.1 |
| Average percentage served | 2.2 | 1.8 | 5.4 | . 3 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 2.0 |
| Establishments Serving in other Ways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None in other ways | 45.1 | 47.7 | 28.1 | 55.4 | 50.8 | 34.1 | 39.2 |
| 1-14\% | 2.4 | 2.8 | - | 3.6 | 4.3 | - | 1.4 |
| 14-34\% | 4.9 | 4.7 | 6.3 | 8.9 | 5.8 | 2.1 | 2.7 |
| 35-64\% | 11.0 | 10.7 | 12.5 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 19.1 | 12.2 |
| 65-84\% | 6.5 | 7.0 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 10.6 | 8.1 |
| Over 84\% | 25.6 | 24.8 | 31.2 | 21.4 | 21.8 | 32.0 | 28.3 |
| Don't know, no answer, refused | 4.5 | 2.3 | 18.8 | - | 5.8 | 2.1 | 8.1 |
| Average percentage served | 36.9 | 35.5 | 47.8 | 28.4 | 30.3 | 48.3 | 42.4 |

Note: Percentages, other than average percentages, are based on total establishments interviewed. Average percentages are computed by assigning the cases in any one of the six intervals to the midpoint of the interval, and taking an average of all the cases.

TYPES OF PORTIONS BOUGHT NOVEMBER, 1958
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public |  | Less | 140,000 |
|  |  | Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 40,000 \end{aligned}$ | and Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (71) | (41) | (30) | (37) | (34) |
|  | $\pm$ | $\underline{2}$ | $\underline{L}$ | \& | $\underline{1}$ |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Cooked - breaded | 45.2 | 42.2 | 50.0 | 41.1 | 49.6 |
| Cooked - plain | 8.7 | 2.1 | 19.9 | 4.5 | 13.7 |
| Uncooked - breaded | 38.9 | 42.2 | 33.4 | 38.8 | 38.6 |
| Uncooked - plain | 22.6 | 28.2 | 1.3 .3 | 18.3 | 27.6 |

Table 18

QUANTITY OF PORTIONS BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958

|  | Total Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Establishments } \end{gathered}$ | User Establishment. |
| Cooked - breaded | 4,223 | 3.0 | 117.3 |
| Cooked - plain | 373 | (b) | 53.3 |
| Uncooked - breaded | 3,336 | 2.4 | 107.6 |
| Uncooked - plain | 2,434 | 1.7 | 135.2 |

(b) Less than half a pound.
*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

Table 19

AMOUNT OF PORTIONS BOUGHT BY ESTABLISHMENTS, AS COMPARED TO THE PREVIOUS YEAR
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volune

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public |  | Less | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating Places | Institutions | Than $\$ 40,000$ | and Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (71) | (41) | (30) | (37) | (34) |
|  | ¢ | \% | \& | \% |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Use more now | 23.8 | 16.0 | 36.7 | 22.7 | 25.0 |
| Use about the same | 53.8 | 52.0 | 56.6 | 59.1 | 47.2 |
| Use less now | 1.2 | 2.0 | - | - | 2.8 |
| Don't know | 20.0 | 28.0 | 6.7 | 18.2 | 22.2 |
| No answer | 1.2 | 2.0 | - | - | 2.8 |

Table 20

## SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITH <br> QUALITY AND CONDITION OF PORTIONS

# IS THE QUALITY OF PORTIONS BETIER THAN THAT OP OTHER 

 FROZEN PROCESSED FISH - FOR WHAT REASONS?|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (71) |
|  | $\pm$ |
|  | 100.0 |
| Say portions better | 12.54 |
| Quality | 5.0 |
| Taste better - tasty, like the flavor | 2.5 |
| Uniform controlled serving - always same amount | 1.3 |
| Ease of preparation - saves time, labor | 1.3 |
| Firmer, don't break | 1.3 |
| Don't know - no answer | 5.0 |
| Portions poorer | $\frac{2.5}{1.3}$ |
| Break too easy | 1.3 |
| Not as tasty - pror flavor, flat | 1.3 |
| About the same | 72.5 |
| Don't know | 10 |
| Nowenswer | 2.5 |

## (71)

## Nowanswer

*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

Table 22

ADVANTAGES OF USING PORTIONS
Total Users of Portions, November, 1958 (71)

Size of portions - uniform, controlled servings, the right size serving
Convenience, ease of preparation - save labor, already prepared
23.8 Fast, timesaving - quicker to serve, prepare Economical - no waste 21.3

Can control food cost better - know profit
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Attractive, eye appealing } & 5.0 \\ \text { Customers like them } & 2.5\end{array}$
Sandtary - cleaner, safer
Taste better 2.5
No bones
Quality
1.3

All others
No advantages 2.5

Don't know, no answer 1.3

Table 23

## dISADVANTAGES OF USING PORTIONS

## Total

Total Users of Portions

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Not economical - more expensive to buy | 6.3 |
| Quality not as good - not always sure what's |  |
| in them | 3.8 |
| Portions wrong size - too small | 3.8 |
| Lack flavor - not as tasty, sometimes dry | 1.3 |
| Cannot be frozen - deteriorate rapidly when |  |
| thawed | 1.3 |
| All others | 10.0 |
| No disadvantages | 76.3 |
| Don't know, no answer | 2.5 |

* Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.


## Table 24

DO ESTABLISHMENTS THINK CUSTOMERS PREFER PORTIONS TO OTHER
FROZEN PROCESSED FISH - FOR WHAT REASONS?

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (71) |
|  | $\underline{L}$ |
|  | 100.0 |
| Think customers like portions better | 23.8* |
| Uniform controlled servings - always the same amount | 15.0 |
| Customers order - seem to like them | 5.0 |
| Faster quicker to serve - no waiting | 2.5 |
| Attractive - eye appealing | 2.5 |
| Good quality - choice fish | 1.5 |
| Taste better - like flavor | 1.2 |
| Don't know - no answer | 1.2 |
| Think customers like portions less | 2.5* |
| Customers don't order - ask for them | 1.2 |
| All others |  |
| Think customers like portions about the same | 45.0 |
| Don't know | 21.2 |
| No answer | 7.5 |

*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

## Table 25

## AVERAGE WEIGHT OF PORTIONS AND AVERAGE NUMBEK

OF SERVINGS PER PACKAGE

| Total users portions, November, 1958 | 71 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Average weight of packnge of portions, in pounds | 6.5 |
| Average number of servings per package | 31.9 |
| Average weight of individual servings, in ounces | 3.3 |
| Average weight of individual portions, in ounces |  |

Note: Average weight of portions does not equal average weight of individual servings since some operators obtained more than one serving from a portion, while other operators used more than one portion for a serving.

Table 26

## SAT LSFACTION WITH THE SIZE OF

PORTIONS IN A PACKAGE

## Total

Total Users of Portions
Satisfied
Dissatisfied ..... 1.3
Don't know, no answer ..... 5.0

Table 27

PERCENTAGE OF PORTIONS SERVED FRIED, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER HAYS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public |  | Les 8 | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 40,000 \end{aligned}$ | and Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (71) | (41) | (30) | (37) | (34) |
|  | $\pm$ | \& | 2 | $\pm$ | $\pm$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried |  |  |  |  |  |
| None fried | 11.2 | 4.0 | 23.3 | 9.1 | 13.9 |
| 1-14\% | 1.3 | 2.0 | 3 | 9. | 2.8 |
| 15-34\% | 1.3 | - | 3.3 |  | 2.8 |
| 35-64\% | 7.5 | 8.0 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 8.3 |
| 65-84\% | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 2.3 | 19.4 |
| Over 84\% | 68.7 | 76.0 | 56.7 | 81.8 | 52.8 |
| Average percentage served | 75.2 | 81.9 | 64.0 | 80.8 | 68.3 |
| Establishments Serving Broiled |  |  |  |  |  |
| None broiled | 86.2 | 86.0 | 86.7 | 93.2 | 77.7 |
| 1-14\% | 3.7 | 6.0 | - | 2.3 | 5.6 |
| 15-34\% | 6.2 | 4.0 | 10.0 | 4.5 | 8.3 |
| 35-64\% | 1.3 | - | 3.3 | - | 2.8 |
| 65-84\% | 1.3 | 2.0 |  | - | 2.8 |
| Over 84\% | 1.3 | 2.0 | - | - | 2.8 |
| Average percentage served | 4.5 | 4.8 | 4.1 | 1.3 | 8.5 |

Table 27
(Contd.)

PERCENTAGE OF PORTIONS SERVED FRIED, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS
(Continued)
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of | stablishment | Sal | lume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 4 \dot{0}, 000 \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 40,000$ and Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (71) | (41) | (30) | (37) | (34) |
|  | \& | q | 2 | q |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Baked |  |  |  |  |  |
| None baked | 78.7 | 86.0 | 66.7 | 81.8 | 75.0 |
| 1-14\% | 5.0 | 8.0 | - | 4.5 | 5.6 |
| 15-348 | 1.3 | - | 3.3 | 2.3 | - |
| 35-64\% | 5.0 | 4.0 | 6.7 | 2.3 | 8.3 |
| 65-84\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| Over 84\% | 10.0 | 2.0 | 23.3 | 9.1 | 11.1 |
| Average percentage served | 12.4 | 4.4 | 25.7 | 10.4 | 14.8 |
| Establishments Serving in Other Ways |  |  |  |  |  |
| None in other ways | 98.7 | 98.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 97.2 |
| 1-14\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| 15-34\% | 1.3 | 2.0 | - | - | 2.8 |
| 35-64\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| 65-84\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| Over 84\% | - | - | - | - | - |
| Average percentage served | . 3 | . 5 | - | - | . 7 |

## Table 28

DO ESTABLISHMENTS COOK PORTIONS WHEXE STTUL FROZEN? According to Type of Establishment and Soles Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public | - | Less | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating |  | Than | and |
|  |  | Places | Institutions | \$40,000 | Over |
| Tatal Users of Portions | (71) | (41) | (30) | (37) | (34) |
|  | 2 | 2 | $\pm$ | \& | $\pm$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, cook while frozenNo, do not cook vhile frozen | 63.8 | 64.0 | 63.3 | 61.4 | 66.7 |
|  | 36.2 | 36.0 | 36.7 | 38.6 | -33-3 |


|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (71) |
|  |  |
|  | 100.0 |
| Say portions more expensive | 15.0 |
| Price includes processing and packaging - preprepa- <br> ration would tend to raise cost | 12.5 |
| Cost is more for amount of serving | 2.5 |
| Portions less expensive | $\frac{22.5 *}{12.5}$ |
| Less or no waste | 5.0 |
| Labor saving - requires no preparation | 5.0 |
| Uniform controlled servings | 5.0 |
| Can control food costs better - know your profit | 5.0 2.5 |
| Goes further - more servings from package | 1.3 |
| Time saving | 1.3 |
| No spoflage - can keep in freezer, can keep until ready to use | 1.3 |
| About the same | 38.8 |
| Don't know | 13.7 |
| ancuer | 10.0 |

* Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.


## Table 30

WHEN QRDERING PORTIONS FROM SUPPLIERS, DO ESTABLISHMENTS SPECIFY THE KIND OF FISH?
According to tType of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public |  | Less | \$40,000 |
|  |  | Eating Places | Institutions | Than <br> $\$ 40,000$ | and Over |
| Total Users of Portions | (71) | (41) | (30) | (37) | (34) |
|  | $\underline{L}$ | $\pm$ | $\underline{2}$ | \& | q |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Specify kind of fish | 76.2 | 90.0 | 53.3 | 79.5 | 72.2 |
| Do not specify kind or'risb | 20.0 | 8.0 | 40.0 | 20.5 | 19.5 |
| No answer | 3.8 | . 2.0 | 6.7 | - | 8. 3 |

## Table 31

## WOUL THE ESTABLISHMENTS LIKE TO HAVE OTHER PORTION CONTROLLED SEA FOOD ITEMS NOT NOW AVAILABLE?

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | Less Then \$40,000 | $\$ 40,000$ and Over |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (288) | (232) | (56) | (159) | (129) |
|  | $\underline{6}$ | 1 | 2 | も | $\pm$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, would like other items | 5.4 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.4 | 4.1 |
| No, would not like other items | 84.7 | 83.4 | 91.1 | 84.1 | 85.5 |
| Don't know | 8.1 | 8.3 | 7.1 | 7.9 | 8.3 |
| No answer | 1.8 | 2.2 | - | 1.6 | 2.1 |

## Table 32

## REASONS ESTABLISHMENTS DD NOT BUY PORTIONS DURING NOVEMBER, 1958

|  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |

*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

Table 33

## TYPES OF SUPPLIER PROVIDING FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD TO ESTABLISEMENTS

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Then } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (288) | (79) | (80) | (45) | (84) |
|  | $\underline{2}$ | \& | \% | \$ | $\underline{1}$ |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Sea food processors | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.3 | - | 6.5 |
| Sea food wholesalers | 39.5 | 23.2 | 34.4 | 45.3 | 58.7 |
| Frozen food distributors | 28.1 | 33.4 | 25.6 | 33.9 | 21.7 |
| All other, grocery stores, supermarkets | 25.7 | 37.4 | 31.1 | 18.9 | 12.0 |
| No answer | 3.9 | 3.0 | 5.6 | 1.9 | 4.3 |

* Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.


## Table 34

DISTANCE OF ESTABLISHMENT FROM MAIN SUPPLIER OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD
According to Location

|  | Total | Out of Central Business District | $\quad$ In <br> Central <br> Business <br> District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | （288） | （243） | （45） |
|  | 中 | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Less than 10 miles | 81.1 | 79．3． | 92.0 |
| 10－50 miles | 14.7 | 16.5 | 4.0 |
| 51 － 100 miles | － | － | － |
| More than 100 miles | ． 3 | － | 2.0 |
| Don＇t know | 3.6 | 4.2 | － |
| No answer | ． 3 | － | 2.0 |

## Table 35

## FREQUENCY OF DELIVERIES OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public } \\ & \text { Eating } \\ & \text { Places } \end{aligned}$ | Institutions | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$100,000 <br> and Over |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (288) | (232) | (56) | (79) | (80) | (45) | (84) |
|  | L | $\underline{1}$ | \& | \& | \& | ¢ | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Every day | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 2.2 | - | 8.7 |
| 2-4 times per week | 15.5 | 17.6 | 5.3 | 6.1 | 15.6 | 24.5 | 20.6 |
| Once a week | 50.9 | 54.3 | 33.9 | 59.6 | 52.2 | 51.0 | 40.2 |
| 2-3 times per month | 11.4 | 10.1 | 17.9 | 9.1 | 13.3 | 3.8 | 16.3 |
| Once a month | 9.6 | 8.3 | 16.1 | 12.1 | 7.8 | 9.4 | 8.7 |
| Less than once a month | 7.2 | 5.4 | 16.1 | 2.1 | 5.6 | 9.4 | 3.3 |
| Don't know, no answer | 1.8 | . 7 | 7.1 | - | 3.3 | 1.9 | 2.2 |

Table 36

## CAN SUPPLIERS OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD IMPROVE SERVICES TO ESTABLISHMENTS?

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sen Food | (288) | (79) | (80) | (45) | (84) |
|  | 曻 | \% | \& | \& |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, can improve services | 4.8 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 9.4 | 7.6 |
| No, cannot improve services | 88.6 | 96.0 | 87.8 | 75.5 | 89.1 |
| Don't know | 5.1 | 2.0 | 6.7 | 13.2 | 2.2 |
| No answer | 1.5 | - | 3.3 | 1.9 | 1.1 |

## Table 37

## AMOUNT SPENT FOR FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD DURING PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | Less Than \$10,000 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 940,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$1200,000 <br> and <br> Over |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (288) | (232) | (56) | (79) | (80) | (45) | (84) |
|  | t | \& | 2 | \& | 2 | ¢ | ¢ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under \$250 | 41.7 | 44.5 | 24.0 | 74.2 | 40.4 | 31.3 | 8.9 |
| \$250-499 | 15.5 | 15.4 | 16.0 | 15.5 | 17.3 | 15.6 | 13.4 |
| \$500-999 | 17.1 | 17.3 | 16.0 | 6.9 | 23.1 | 28.1 | 15.6 |
| \$1,000-2,499 | 15.0 | 13.6 | 24.0 | - | 19.2 | 15.6 | 28.9 |
| \$2,500-4,999 | 4.3 | 3.7 | 8.0 | - | - | 6.3 | 13.4 |
| \$5,000-9,999 | 2.7 | 3.1 | - | 3.4 | - | 3.1 | 4.4 |
| \$10,000-14,999 | 1.1 | . 6 | 4.0 | - | - | - | 4.4 |
| \$15,000-29,999 | 1.1 | . 6 | 4.0 | - | - | - | 4.4 |
| \$30,000-49,999 | . 5 | - | 4.0 | - | - | - | 2.2 |
| \$50,000-99,999 | . 5 | . 6 | - | - | - | - | 2.2 |
| \$100,000 and over | . 5 | . 6 | - | - | - | - | 2.2 |

## Table 38

## profitability to establishments of frozen processed sea food and other high protein foons

According to Sales Volume and Type of Establishment

|  |  | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (288) | (232) | (56) | (79) | (80) | (45) | (84) |
|  | d | \& | \$ | ¢ | \$ | 中 |  |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | $\underline{100.0}$ |
| Say sea food more profitahle than other high protein foods | 28.4 | 32.7 | 7.1 | 32.3 | 28.9 | 26.4 | 25.0 |
| ```Say meat (unspecified) more profitable``` than sea food | 16.5 | 19.4 | 1.8 | 16.2 | 18.9 | 24.5 | 9.8 |
| Say beef more profitable than sea food | 3.3 | 4.0 | - | 1.0 | 1.1 | 3.8 | 7.6 |
| Say all foods the same in profitability | 3.0 | 3.6 | - | 2.0 | 4.4 | 3.8 | 2.2 |
| Say eggs more profitable than sea food | 3.0 | 3.6 | - | - | 5.6 | 3.8 | 3.3 |
| Say miscellaneous other foods more profitable than sea food | 5.4 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 7.8 | 3.8 | 6.5 |
| Nonprofit establishments | 15.0 | - | 89.3 | 8.1 | 13.3 | 15.1 | 23.9 |
| Don't know | 25.7 | 30.9 | - | 313 | 23.3 | 24.5 | 22.8 |
| No answer | 3.6 | 4.3 | - | 6.1 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 3.3 |

* Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.


## Table 39

DO THE ESTABLISHMENTS KNOW THEY CAN BUY GOVERHENT
INSPECTED OR GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA POOD?
According to Type of Establishment

Total Users of Frozen
Processed Sea Food

| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (288) | (232) | (56) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $\underline{2}$ | $\pm$ | $\pm$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, know they can | 68.6 | 65.5 | 83.9 |
| No, do not know they can | 31.4 | 34.5 | 16.1 |

## Table 40

DO THE ESTARLISHMENTS BUY GOVERNMENT INSPECTED OR GRADED FROREN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?

According to Type of Establishment

|  | Total | Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments Knowing Government Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food Was Available | (204) | (157) | (47) |
|  | $\pm$ | $\pm$ | $\pm$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, do buy | 89.1 | 89.6 | 87.2 |
| No, do not buy | 1.3 | 1.1 | 2.1 |
| No ansuer | 9.6 | 9.3 | 10.7 |


|  | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Purchasers of Government Inspected or Graded Sea Food | (183) | (142) | (41) |
|  | 里 | क | $\underline{1}$ |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| spected foods are safe - pure, , no germs or disease | 35.8 | 36.2 | 34.1 |
| supplier carries <br> use better products, more | 33.8 | 35.0 | 29.3 |
| ity <br> - easy to serve, ready to | 30.4 | 28.8 | 36.6 |
| on controlled | 5.9 | 6.7 | 2.4 |
| nent inspected - wouldn't | 4.9 | 5.5 | 2.4 |
|  | 2.0 | 1.8 | 2.4 |
| as that it's bought | 2.0 | 1.2 | 4.9 |
| 1 t | 1.0 | 1.2 | - |
|  | 1.0 | 1.2 | - |
| answer | 4.9 | 4.3 | 7.3 |

* Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.


## Table 42

HAS GOVERNMENT INSPECTION AFFECTED THE AMOUNT OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD BOUGHT BY THE ESTABLISHMENT?

Accoriing to Type of Establishment

|  | Public <br> Eating <br> Total Users of Government <br> Inspected Frazen <br> Processed Sea Food | (183) | (142) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Table 43

IF GOVERNMENT INSFECTED OR GRADED FROZEN
FROCESSED SEA FOOD WERE AVAILAELE WOULD
THE ESTARLISHMENT BUY MORE OR LESS?

Total Establishments Not Know-
ing Government Inspected or Graded Frozen Processed Sea Food Was Available

Total

Say they would buy less
About the same
69.5

Don't know

No answer

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of <br> Public <br> Eating <br> Places | Establishment Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000 \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { snd } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (883) | (818) | (65) | (508) | (214) | (75) | (86) |
|  | \$ | $\pm$ | \% | $\pm$ | ¢ | \$ | $\underline{L}$ |
|  | $\underline{100.0}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Have served frozen processed sea food before | 6.8 | 5.6 | 26.2 | 6.3 | 7.3 | 6.7 | 8.1 |
| Lacked flavor - own prepared fish has better flavor | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 2.3 | - | 6.8 |
| No Cemant - didn't sell enough, no volume, customers prefer other foods | 1.5 | 1.6 | - | 1.8 .5 | 1.9 1.1 | - | 1.9 |
| Prefer to serve fresh fish | - 7 | -8 | - | . 6 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 1.9 |
| More expensive than other forms of fish | $\cdot 7$ | . 3 | - | . 2 | - | 2.2 | - |
| No storage <br> All others | .3 2.3 | . 9 | 24.6 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 4.4 | - |
| Have not served frozen processed ses food before | 92. $0^{*}$ | 93.9 | 61.5 | 22.9 | 21.2 | 92.2 | 88.4 |
| Sell little or no fish - no demand, call for it, not in that business | 46.7 | 48.9 | 13.8 | 54.9 | 37.5 | 31.1 | 35.0 |
| Use fresh fish - prefer to serve fresh fish, fresh fish available all year | 24.5 | 25.3 | 12.3 | 23.2 | 24.1 | 34.4 | 24.3 |
| Like taste, freshness of fresh fish - don t trust frozen food, fresh fish tastes better. some frozen is kept too long | 10.9 | 110 | 9.2 | 75 | 16.1 | 18.9 | 11.7 |
| is kept too long <br> No storage facilities - no freezer | 6.3 | 6.1 | 92 | 6.7 | 7.3 | 2.2 | 4.9 6.8 |
| No storage facilities - no freezer <br> Too expensive - cheaper to use fresh, prepare ourselves | 55 | 5.6 | 46 | 4.5 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 6.8 |
| Unable to handle preparation - no equipment, not enough room, no time, would need extra help | 2.0 .7 | 1.9 | 3.15 | 1.5 .5 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 2.9 10 10 |
| Just opened, don't know what I'll sell | 1.7 | . 8 | 15.4 | 1.1 | 3.4 | - | 1.9 |
| All others Don't know, no answer | 2.6 | 1.9 | 13.8 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 8.7 |
| Don't know | .2 | 2 | - | - | - | 1.1 | 1.0 |
|  | 1.0 | 3 | 12 . 3 | . 8 | 1.5 | - | 1.9 |

* Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.


## Table 45

DO ESTABLISHMENTS HAVE COLD STORAGE FACILITIES FOR KEEPING FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,979 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,399 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (1171) | (949) | (77) | (44) | (201) | (587) | (294) | (120) | (170) |
|  | g | $\pm$ | \& | 里 | \& | ¢ | \$ | ¢ |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, have cold storage facilities | 61.8 | 62.8 | 48.1 | 81.8 | 54.0 | 54.7 | 61.3 | 75.5 | 79.0 |
| No, do not have cold storage facilities | 38.0 | 36.9 | 51.9 | 18.2 | 46.0 | 44.9 | 38.7 | 24.5 | 21.0 |
| No answers | . 2 | $\cdot 3$ | - | - | - | . 4 | - | - | - |
| Average capacity, in cuble feet | 41.5 | 38.2 | (a) | (a) | 41.3 | 27.7 | 24.5 | 70.5 | 110.1 |

DO ESTABLISHMENTS HAVE COLD STORAGE FACILITIES FOR KEEPING FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD? According to Nonusers of Sea Food and Users Not Using Frozen Processed Sea Food

|  | Total | Nonusers of Sea Food | Users Not Using Frozen Processed Sea Food |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (883) |  |  |
|  | $\pm$ | \$ | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 22.0 | 78.0 |
| Yes, have cold storage facilities | 53.1 | 10.2 | 42.9 |
| No, do not have cold storage facilities | 46.6 | 21.8 | 34.8 |
| No answer | . 3 | - | . 3 |

## DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE

(Tables a through icontain classification data regarding operations of the establishments)

Table a

TOTAL RECEIPTS FROM MEALS SERVED DURING 1957 OR LAST FISCAL YEAR
According to Type of Establishments

|  | Total | Public Resteurants | Scbools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Otbers } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments | (2171) | (949) | (77) | (44) | (101) |
|  | ¢ | $\pm$ | $\pm$ | \& | \% |
| Total Receipts | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Less than $\$ 10,000$ | 50.9 | 51.8 | 45.4 | 27.3 | 54.9 |
| \$10,000-39,999 | 25.0 | 26.5 | 24.7 | 13.6 | 15.3 |
| \$40,000-99,999 | 10.2 | 9.2 | 11.7 | 20.5 | 14.5 |
| \$100,000 and over | 13.9 | 12.5 | 18.2 | 38.6 | 15.3 |

## Table b

AMOUNT ESTABLISHMENES SPENT FOR FOOD DURING PREVIOUS TWELVE MONTRS
According to Thpe of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Restaurants | Schools， Plants | Hospitals， Welfare Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | （1171） | （949） | （77） | （44） | （101） | （587） | （294） | （120） | （170） |
|  | ¢ | 中 | 中 | \＄ | \＆ | ¢ | 中 | $\underline{q}$ | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under \＄$\$ 1,000$ | 11.2 | 12.2 | － | － | 10.7 | 21.6 | 3.1 | － | 1.1 |
| \＄1，000－2，499 | 23.6 | 25.6 | 19.1 | 8.0 | 12.5 | 42.9 | 10.3 | 1.5 | 2.2 |
| \＄2，500－4，999 | 15.9 | 16.9 | 9.5 | 4.0 | 14.3 | 23.8 | 15.9 | 1.5 | － |
| \＄5，000－9，999 | 13.3 | 13.1 | 9.5 | 12.0 | 17.9 | 8.9 | 26.1 | 10.4 | 3.3 |
| \＄20，000－14，999 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 4.8 | 4.0 | 5.4 | 1.3 | 15.9 | 9.0 | 1.1 |
| \＄15，000－29，999 | 9.0 | 8.1 | 23.8 | 16.0 | 8.9 | ． 6 | 22.6 | 17.9 | 2.2 |
| \＄30，000－49，999 | 6.3 | 5.6 | 9.5 | 12.0 | 8.9 | ． 6 | 3.6 | 43.3 | 4.3 |
| \＄50，000－99，999 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 23.8 | 8.0 | 10.7 | － | 1.0 | 14.9 | 41.3 |
| \＄100，000－249，999 | 4.5 | 3.4 | － | 24.0 | 8.9 | ． 3 | ． 5 | 1.5 | 29.3 |
| \＄250，000 and over | 2.4 | 2.1 | － | 12.0 | 1.8 | － | 1.0 | － | 15.2 |

## Table c

## PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL OPERATING COST SPENT FOR FOOD IN PREVIOUS TWELVE MONTHS

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of Establyshment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public <br> Hestaurants | Schools, Plents | Hospitals, <br> Welfare <br> Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { others } \end{aligned}$ | Less Than $\$ 10.000$ | $\$ 10,000-$ $39,999$ | $\$ 40,000-$ $99,999$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10 \tilde{0}, 000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (1171) | (949) | (77) | (44) | (101) | (587) | (294) | (120) | (270) |
|  | \& | 2 | \% | $z$ | 2 | \& | \& | L |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under 5\% for food | 4 | . 5 | - | - | - | . 9 | - | - | - |
| $5-148$ | 9.7 | 10.9 | - | 25.0 | - | 15.5 | 6.5 | 3.0 | - |
| 15-24\% | 16.9 | 19.1 | - | 8.3 | 5.9 | 26.8 | 11.4 | 1.5 | 3.6 |
| 25-34\% | 18.8 | 19.3 | 5.4 | 8.3 | 25.5 | 24.0 | 19.9 | 7.6 | 4.7 |
| 35-44\% | 15.7 | 15.9 | 5.4 | 25.0 | 19.6 | 8.8 | 15.9 | 18.2 | 40.5 |
| 45-54\% | 22.4 | 19.7 | 67.6 | 25.0 | 19.6 | 13.1 | 22.4 | 45.4 | 40.5 |
| 55-64\% | 5.2 | 4.1 | 10.8 | - | 13.7 | 2.7 | 6.5 | 9.1 | 8.3 |
| 65-74\% | 4.1 | 3.6 | 5.4 | - | 9.8 | $3 \cdot 3$ | 6.5 | 6.1 | - |
| 75-84\% | 5.6 | 5.7 | 2.7 | 8.4 | 5.9 | 4.0 | 9.4 | 6.1 | 2.4 |
| 85 - 94 \% | 1.2 | 1.2 | 2.7 | - | - | . 9 | 1.5 | 3.0 | - |
| 95-100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table d

## AVERAGE NUMBER OF MEALS SERVED BY ESTABLISHMENTS

## According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  |  |  | pe of Est | atlishment |  |  | Sales | olume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public <br> Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99.999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100.000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | 1171 | 949 | 77 | 44 | 101 | 587 | 293 | 121 | 170 |
| Average Number of Main Meals Served |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Midday, weekdays | 111 | 86 | 321 | 355 | 112 | 34 | 87 | 173 | 424 |
| Sea food meals | 14 | 11 | 35 | 81 | 9 | 3 | 11 | 21 | 63 |
| Midday, Saturdays and Sundays | 52 | 44 | 5 | 300 | 70 | 16 | 34 | 70 | 220 |
| Sea food meals | 4 | 4 | - | 10 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 18 |
| Evening, weekdays | 51 | 45 | 6 | 285 | 48 | 13 | 31 | 77 | 236 |
| Sea food meals | 7 | 7 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 35 |
| Evening, Saturdays and Sundays | 43 | 38 | 4 | 245 | 41 | 12 | 27 | 59 | 189 |
| Sea food meals | 5 | 6 | - | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 27 |

Table e

## AVERAGE PRICE PER MEAL SERVED

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public <br> Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Hospitals, Welfare Establishments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { W100,000 } \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Establishments | (1171) | (949) | (77) | (44) | (101) | (587) | (294) | (120) | (170) |
|  | $\underline{4}$ | \& | \& | 中 | $\pm$ | \& | $\underline{\chi}$ | \& | $\underline{1}$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Under \$. 25 | . 9 | . 1 | 15.6 | - | - | 1.3 | . 9 | - | . 5 |
| \$. 25 - . 49 | 8.0 | 4.8 | 42.8 | 4.5 | 16.9 | 9.1 | 8.0 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| \$.50-.74 | 23.9 | 24.0 | 7.8 | 4.5 | 39.6 | 24.1 | 25.6 | 23.0 | 20.5 |
| \$.75-.99 | 26.8 | 29.4 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 24.2 | 29.4 | 30.4 | 21.7 | 14.9 |
| \$1.00-1.49 | 20.3 | 23.2 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 8.9 | 24.1 | 18.2 | 17.5 | 12.3 |
| \$1.50-1.99 | 6.1 | 7.1 | - | - | 3.2 | 4.8 | 8.0 | 11.2 | 4.1 |
| \$2.00-2.49 | 1.9 | 2.2 | - | - | - | . 8 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 4.1 |
| \$2.50-2.99 | 1.3 | 1.6 | - | - | - | . 7 | . 3 | 3.5 | 3.6 |
| \$3.00-3.99 | 1.4 | 1.6 | - | - | . 8 | . 6 | . 6 | 2.8 | 4.6 |
| \$4.00-4.99 | . 6 | . 7 | - | - | . 8 | - | . 3 | . 7 | 3.6 |
| \$5.00 and over | . 4 | . 4 | - | - | - | - | - | . 7 | 2.1 |
| No answer | 6.1 | 4.9 | 19.5 | 13.6 | 5.6 | 4.1 | 5.1 | 6.3 | 14.9 |
| Nonprofit establishment | 2.3 | - | 3.9 | 66.1 | - | 1.0 | . 6 | 3.5 | 9.2 |

Table f

## NUMBER OF REGULAR EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN PREPARING AND SERVING FOOD

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total establishments | 1171 | 587 | 293 | 121 | 170 |
| Average number per establishment | 6 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 27 |

## Table g

SEATING CAPACITY OF ESTABLISHMENTS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Restaurants | Schools, Plants | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Mospitals, } \\ \text { Welfare } \\ \text { Establishments }\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { Others } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total establishments | 1171 | 949 | 77 | 44 | 101 | 587 | 193 | 121 | 170 |
| Average seating capacity, in seats | 78 | 64 | 235 | 318 | 40 | 42 | 67 | 97 | 222 |

Table h

NUMBER OF DAYS OF THE WEEK ON WHICH ESTABLISHMENTS SERVE MEALS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Restaurants | Schools, Plants | Rospitals, Welfare Establishments | All others | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Other } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Establishments | (1171) | (949) | (77) | (44) | (101) | (587) | (294) | (120) | (170) |
|  | \$ | \& | \$ | q | E | \% | क | $\pm$ | 2 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | $\underline{100.0}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Serve on 7 days | 47.6 | 50.2 | 2.6 | 90.9 | 35.5 | 47.5 | 45.0 | 44.0 | 54.9 |
| Serve on 6 days | 35.8 | 37.0 | 1.3 | - | 58.1 | 37.8 | 36.7 | 35.7 | 26.7 |
| Serve on 5 days | 15.7 | 11.9 | 93.5 | 9.1 | 4.8 | 13.4 | 17.7 | 20.3 | 16.9 |
| Serve on less than 5 days | . 5 | . 4 | 2.6 | - | 1.6 | 1.0 | - | - | . 5 |
| No answer | . 4 | - 5 | - | - | - | - 3 | . 6 | - | 1.0 |

Table 1

PERCENTAGE OF ESTABLISHMENTS SERVING SPECLALIZED TYPES OF FOOD
According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ \hline 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments | (1171) | (587) | (294) | (120) | (170) |
|  | q | 2 | $\underline{2}$ | \% | q |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments with no specialty | 73.1 | 74.0 | 71.8 | 71.3 | 73.8 |
| Establishments with specialty | $\underline{26.9}{ }^{*}$ | 26.0 | 28.2 | 28.1 | 26.2 |
| Italian food | 9.6 | 10.0 | 13.4 | ¢. 0 | 3.6 |
| Steak or chophouse | 5.1 | 4.3 | 5.4 | 6.3 4.2 | 5.1 |
| Kosher | 2.9 | 2.0 3.8 | 3.1 .8 | 4.2 | . 5 |
| Mexican, Spanish | 2.2 2.1 | 3.8 1.0 | 2.0 | 6.3 | 3.1 |
| Chicese food |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cbicken specialty | 1.4 | 2.7 | $\cdot 3$ | . 7 | 3.1 |
| Sea food | . 8 | . 4 | . 3 | . 7 | 3.1 |
| Barbecue | . .4 | .1 | . | .7 | 1.5 |
| French food |  |  |  |  |  |
| All others | 2.0 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 3.1 |

*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.
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